



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,931	12/15/2003	Steven Tischer	030515 (BLL-0144)	3718
36192	7590	07/09/2007	EXAMINER	
CANTOR COLBURN LLP - BELLSOUTH 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002				HAILE, AWET A
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2609				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/09/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/735,931	TISCHER, STEVEN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Awet A. Haile	2609

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December, 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections – 35 USC§ 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claim 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 21 is directed to a non-statutory subject matter because the claim recites, " storage medium encoded with machine-readable computer program code " which is not a useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof.

Note: To overcome the rejection, it is suggested to the applicant to amend the claims to be written in terms of "computer" readable medium, stored with, embodied with or encoded with a "computer" program or computer executable instructions.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC§ 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or non obviousness.
5. Claims 1 –6, 9-16, 19,20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bianchi (2004/0059921 A1) in view of Labaton et al (5742684)

For claims 1-6, 9-16 and 19 - 21 Bianchi discloses a method for transmitting data over a computer network to a predetermined recipient (see figure 17), the method comprising: modifying at least one data byte in a first data message based on a first message modification key value to obtain a modified first data message (see paragraph 126, lines, 4-6), modifying at least one data byte in a second data message based on a second

modification key value to obtain a modified second data message, transmitting the first and second modified data messages to a first device: determining the first data message in the first device for the predetermined recipient based on the modified first data message and the first message modification key value(see figure 17): and determining the second data message in the first device for the predetermined recipient based on the modified second data message and the second message modification key value(see paragraph 129 lines 1-9) as recited in claim 1 and 11. The first data message comprises voice data (see paragraph 19 lines 3 –4) as recited in claims 9 and 19. The first data message comprises video data (see paragraph 19 lines 3 –4) as recited in claims 10 and 20. A second device configured to receive the transmitted first and second modified data messages and to determine the first data message for the predetermined recipient based on the modified first data message and the first message modification key value, the second device further configured to determine the second data message for the predetermined recipient based on the modified second data message and the second message modification key value (see paragraph 129 lines1-12) as recited in claim 11. Wherein the first and second devices comprise first and second computers, respectively, operatively communicating with one another (see figure 15) as recited in claim 12.

However Bianchi fails to teach the modification key value being determined on a variable parameter as recited in claim 1,11 and 21 the variable parameter comprises a time varying parameter as recited in claims 2 and 13, time- varying parameter includes at least one of a determined hour, minute and second as recited in claims 3 and 14, first message

modification key being determined based on at least one variable parameter and a unique identifier as recited in claim 4 and 15, adding the first message modification key value to the at least one data byte of the first data message as recited in claim 5 and 16. The method of transmitting the modification key values to a first computer as recited in claim 6.

Labaton et al from the same field of endeavor teach the first and second message modification key value being determined based on at least one variable parameter (see column 6, lines 34-40) the variable parameter comprises a time-varying parameter (see column 5, lines 10 – 14). The time-varying parameter includes at least one of a determined hour, minute, and second (see column 3 lines 57 – 64). The first message modification key value being determined based on at least one variable parameter and a unique identifier associated with the predetermined recipient (see column 5 lines 10 – 19). Wherein the modifying at least one byte of the first data message includes adding the first message modification key value to the at least one data byte of the first data message (see column 9, lines 1- 41) transmitting the first and second message modification key values to a first computer (see column 6, lines 35 –36)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method/system of using the time varying parameter to determine the modification key value and then adding the modification key value to the data message as taught by Labaton et al in to the Smart IP phones network

device 80 of Bianchi the motivation for doing this is to prevent unauthorized use of the data message after a preset threshold time.

6. Claims 7, 8, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bianchi and Labaton et al as applied to claim 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Kamperman et al (2002/0004903 A1)

Bianchi and Labaton et al discloses all the subject matter with the exception of, the method transmitting the first and second modified data messages via first communication channel as recited in claims 7 and 17, the first and second message modification key values are both transmitted via a second communication channel as recited in claim 8 and 18.

Kamperman et al from the same field of endeavor teaches the method/system wherein the first and second modified data messages are both transmitted via a first communication channel. The first and second message modification key values are both transmitted via a second communication channel (see paragraph 009, lines 27-30)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method/system of transmitting the data message and the decryption key using separate channels as taught by Kamperman in to the modified Smart IP phone the motivation for doing this is to prevent eavesdrop to the transmitting message.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ehrsam et al (3958081), Wheeler et al (20002/0116608 A1), Subramaniam et al (2004/0039702 A1), Mauritz et al (6853620 B2), Hamlin (7215771 B1) are recited to show a method of transmitting data over a computer network.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Awet Haile whose telephone number is (571) 270-3114. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 10:00 AM – 5:00 PM EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dang Ton, can be reached on (571) 272-3171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, Call 800 –786-9199(IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



DANG T. TON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER